

**CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE  
2004 ANNUAL REPORT**

This report is prepared in compliance with Article V of the Bylaws of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC).

**2004 VOTING MEMBERS**

Mr. John Fisher LOCC	Chairman Assistant General Manager City of Los Angeles DOT 100 S Main St, 10 <sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012
Mr. Farhad Mansourian CSAC	Vice Chairman Director of Public Works Marin County, P.O. Box 4186 San Rafael, CA 94913
Mr. Gary Meis CDOT	Division of Traffic Operations California Department of Transportation 1120 N Street, MS36 Sacramento, CA 95814
Ms. Merry Banks CSAA	Manager Traffic Safety Dept. California State Automobile Association 150 Van Sacramento Ness Avenue MSA03C, San Francisco, CA 94102-1860
Mr. Jacob Babico CSAC	Chief of Traffic Division, DPW San Bernardino County 825 East Third Street San Bernardino, CA 92415
Capt. Bridget Lott & Capt. Lenley Duncan DCHP	California Highway Patrol 2555 First Avenue Sacramento, CA 95818
Mr. Ed Von Borstel LOCC	Deputy Director Public Works & Transportation City of Modesto, 1010 Tenth Street Modesto, CA 95353
Mr. Hamid Bahadori LOCC	Principal Transportation Engineer Auto Club of Southern California, 3333 Fairview Road Costa Mesa, CA 92626

**The following alternate members were designated by the parent organizations to act in the absence of their appointed voting members:**

### **2003 ALTERNATE MEMBERS**

Mr. Mark Greenwood LOCC	Engineering Manager City of Palm Desert 73-510 Fred Waring Dr. Palm Desert, CA 92260
Mr. John Presleigh CSAC	Assistant Director Transportation Division Santa Cruz County DPW Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Mr. Devinder Singh CDOT	Division of Traffic Operations California Department of Transportation 1120 N Street, MS36 Sacramento, CA 95814
Mr. Lewison Lem CSAA	Transportation Policy Manager California State Automobile Association 100 Van Ness Ave 16 <sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102
Mr. George Johnson CSAC	Transportation Director, DPW Riverside County P.O. Box 1090, Riverside, CA 92502
Mr. John Olejnik & Lt. Mark Mulgrew DCHP	California Highway Patrol 2555 First Avenue Sacramento, CA 95818
Mr. Glan Aggarwal LOCC	Deputy Director Public Works City of Vacaville 650 Merchant Street, Vacaville, CA 95688
Ms. Marie Simon ACSC	Transportation Engineer Auto Club of Southern California 3333 Fairview Road, A131 Costa Mesa, CA 92626
<b>SECRETARY</b>	
Mr. Devinder Singh Caltrans	Senior Transportation Engineer Executive Secretary, CTCDC 1120 N Street, MS36 Sacramento, CA 95814

**2004 MEETINGS**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>
January 24, 2004	464 West Fourth St (Room 805), San Bernardino 90012, 92402
May 5, 2004	3501 Civic Center Dr (Board of Supervisors RM), San Rafael, 94913
August 12, 2004	2829 Juan Street (Auditorium), San Diego 92110
December 8, 2004	111 Grand Avenue (Parkview Room 15-700), Oakland, CA 94623

**2004 CTCDC AGENDA ITEMS****Agenda**

<b><u>Item No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>
99-10	Tactile Pedestrian Indicators
99-11	MUTCD Adoption by Caltrans
00-6	Pedestrian Countdown Signal Heads
01-1	Bicycle Pavement Markings
01-9	Proposal to Modify approved Experiment, "In-Roadway Warning Lights at R/R Crossings."
02-16	Traffic Signal Warrants 1 & 2
04-1	Proposal to adopt MUTCD 2003 Section 4E.07 Countdown Pedestrian Signals
04-2	In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Signs
04-4	MUTCD 2003 Revision No.1 (Pharmacy Signing)
04-5	Roundabout signs & Pavement Markings Guidance Proposal
04-6	Proposed School Bus Sign, "Do not Pass Stopped School Bus Flashing Red Lights" Increased Fines Apply CVC 22454.5
04-7	Yellow Change Intervals Timing for the Signals
04-8	Railroad Preemption Signals
04-9	Request to Experiment with "Watch The Road" Sign
04-10	Slow for the Cone Zone Sign
04-11	Bicycle May Use full Lane
04-12	Requests for experimentation with "Flashing Yellow Arrows"
04-13	Older California Traffic Safety Task Force proposal to Amend MUTCD Sections 2B.45, 2C.50 and 4E.10
04-14	Proposed California Supplement Text for Non-Compliant Traffic Control Devices on Existing Highways.

**INFORMATION ITEMS:**

- 01-1 Bicycle Pavement Markings
- 04-A Left/U-Turn Traffic Signal Light Logic Improvement”
- 03-6 Radar Speed Sign
- 04-D Older Driver’s Task Force
- 04-5 Roundabout signs & Pavement Markings Guidance Proposal
- 04-15 Older California Traffic Safety Task Force Proposal to Amend MUTCD Sections 2B.33, 2B.34, 2B.35, 2B.37, 2B.38 4D.10 and 4E.10

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

- 99-11 MUTCD Adoption by Caltrans
- 04-3 Adoption of MUTCD 2003 Section 2A.08 Retroreflectivity and Illumination.
- 04-5 Roundabout signs & Pavement Markings Guidance Proposal
- 02-16 Traffic Signal Warrants 1 & 2
- 04-B Yellow Change Intervals Timing for the Signals
- 04-C Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program
- 04-E Timetable for Combining the MUTCD 2003 and CA Supplement to a single document
- 04-F Section 2C.46 MUTCD 2003 (Distance to place W2-1 or W2-2 Signs)
- 04-G Overhead Pedestrian/School Crosswalk Signing wit Yellow Flashing Beacons

## **COMMITTEE ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

### **99-10 Tactile Pedestrian Indicators**

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation (LADOT) requested experimentation approval with tactile pedestrian indicators (TPI) five years ago. At that time, birdcalls were the only standard device approved for use in California for accessible pedestrian signals. LADOT concluded that the TPI technology is a viable alternative to the bird call technology. The conclusion from the TPI experiment was that the device was helpful for visually impaired pedestrians. Meanwhile the Committee has recommended adoption of the MUTCD language along with the California Supplement. The MUTCD language allows a number of different options including TPI. The LADOT requested the Committee to accept the final report submitted by LADOT and close the item.

The Committee accepted the report submitted by LADOT and closed item 99-10 TPI.

### **99-11 MUTCD Adoption by Caltrans**

Caltrans requested to place agenda item 99-11, MUTCD adoption along with California Supplement was placed on the agenda during the year of 1999. The purpose was to initiate a discussion within the Caltrans and with the CTCDC members in regards to the adoption of Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices” (MUTCD) along with California Supplement. Caltrans believes that the motorists should see similar type of traffic control devices when they travel from one state to another state. The California will be different in certain cases, because of the legislation’s’, however the focus should be to keep the uniformity through out the nation as much as possible.

Caltrans requested that the CTCDC made recommendation to Caltrans for the adoption of MUTCD 2003 along with California Supplement (as posted on the Supplement web site) as the standard for all official traffic control devices, in accordance with Sections 21350 and 214 00 of the California Vehicle Code.

Starting in early 2003, draft texts were prepared for each part of the California Supplement and submitted to CTCDC and Caltrans internal advisory committee for review. To help the review process, further discussions were held in two separate workshops held over a period of 4 days with CTCDC members in July and September 2003. Based on these reviews, discussions and recommendations, the draft text was finalized for all parts and made available and open to the public for comment in November 2003, through the California Supplement web site.

Although the draft text for the California Supplement to the MUTCD 2000 was completed in 2003, it was decided (at the January 22, 2004 CTCDC meeting) to adopt the MUTCD 2003 Edition (which had recently been released by FHWA) rather than the 2000 Edition. This resulted in postponing the MUTCD adoption for California to May 2004. A CTCDC workshop was held in Sacramento on March 25 and 26, 2004 to discuss the 2003 Edition changes. Based on these workshop discussions, the draft text for the California Supplement has been finalized and made available and open to the public for comment through the California Supplement web site. To satisfy the public comments period requirement, the draft text would be open for comments until May 16, 2004. Any editorial comments will be incorporated, however any comments regards to the policy change will be brought back to the Committee for review and action.

During the May 6, 2004 meeting, Committee made recommendation that Caltrans to adopt MUTCD 2003 along with the California Supplement as a standard for all the traffic control devices in according to the CVC 21350 and 21400

## **00-6 Pedestrian Countdown Signal Heads**

Committee adopted the final report on the experiment with pedestrian countdown signal heads as submitted by the City of San Francisco.

## **01-1 Bicycle Pavement Markings (BPM)**

The City of San Francisco was authorized to conduct experiments with the BPMs. The City of San Francisco presented an interim report to the Committee and then the final report during the January 2004 meeting.

The Committee recommended that Caltrans adopt "Chevron Bike Symbol" as a standard traffic control device and adopt the language for Support, Option, Standard, Guidance and Option as revised by Chairman Fisher, under Section 9C.103 in California.

## **01-9 Proposal to Modify Approved Experiment, "In-Roadway Warning Lights at R/R Crossings."**

The Visual Detection Laboratory (VDL) at U.C. Berkeley requested an approval to slightly change an already approved experiment with IRWLs at the R/R crossing. The proposal is to test a different flash pattern for two weeks and then switched back to the original approval. The approved experiment will use five red LED lights embedded in the roadway (protruding less than ½ ") near the highway-railroad grade crossing and three amber lights ahead of them in the approach lane. When a train approach the intersection all the lights flash simultaneously

The Committee approved the experiment by changing the flash rate from 150/110 ms on/off to 100/100 ms on/off and added that if the wig-wag pattern of embedded lights proved beneficial, then the modified flash rate could be used in more general applications.

## **02-16 Traffic Signal Warrants 1 & 2**

Committee Member Jacob stated that this item was placed on the agenda in 2002 to restore footnotes for signal warrants I and II, which were deleted during the 1996 update of the Traffic Manual. Subsequently Caltrans adopted the MUTCD 2003 along with the California Supplement. Now, the MUTCD 2003, Section 4C.01 has similar language to those footnotes. However, the language is not clear. During the last meeting, it was suggested to clarify the MUTCD 2003 Section 4C.01 language so that the users can understand and implement correctly. The revised "option" under Section 4C.01 (Italic) is as follows:

### *4C.01 Option:*

At an intersection with high volume of left-turn traffic from the major street, the signal warrant analysis may be performed in a manner that considers the higher of the major-street left-turn volumes as the ~~"minor street" volume and the corresponding single direction of opposing traffic on the major street as the "major street" volume~~ *volume of the major-street left-turn volumes plus the higher volume minor-street approach as the "minor street" volume and both approaches of the major street minus the higher of the major-street left-turn volume as "major street" volume.*

The Committee recommended that Caltrans adopt the revised Section 4C.01 of MUTCD 2003 and include in California Supplement.

**04-1 Proposal to adopt MUTCD 2003 Section 4E.07 Countdown Pedestrian Signals**

The Committee authorized a number of public agencies to conduct experiments with PCSHs. Some of them have submitted their report and strongly recommended adopting the device in California. Some of them still collect data. During the June 2003 meeting, the Committee authorized the Chairman to give administrative approval by letter to local agencies requesting authorization to install PCSH. Caltrans stated that since the MUTCD 2003 has a policy on PCSHs and is consistent with the Committee's authorized experimentation, therefore, the Committee makes a recommendation to Caltrans for the adoption of PCSHs in California.

The Committee recommended that Caltrans adopt MUTCD 2003 Section 4E.07 Countdown Pedestrian Signals in California. The Committee also recommended adopting Section 4E.10 along with 4E.07, because Section 4E.10 is tied with 4E.07.

**04-2 In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Signs**

The City of Alameda's requested experiment with In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Signs.

The Committee noted the MUTCD 2003 includes devices under Section 2B.12 that are similar to the agenda item. The Committee suggested that the City of Alameda should be advised that Caltrans is in the process of adopting the MUTCD 2003 along with the California Supplement, and that MUTCD Section 2B.12 would be discussed during the CTCDC Workshop.

**04-3 Adoption of MUTCD 2003 Section 2A.08 Retroreflectivity and Illumination**

The MUTCD 2003 Section 2A.08 Retroreflectivity and Illumination under standards allows an agency to use LEDs in any format, such as sign symbols or word messages. This allows the use of LEDs in a wider application than currently used. Caltrans would like Committee members input and opinion on the MUTCD language.

The Committee agreed with Caltrans concern and asked whether Caltrans will develop alternate language to the MUTCD for the Committee to review. The Committee noted that the MUTCD language allows the use of LED's for word messages and symbols, even on guide signs. A local agency could install LEDs on a Yield sign. What message would motorists get if an agency placed a red LED on a "yield" sign? The Committee suggested that California should take the lead in restricting the use of LEDs on signs. The following language was adopted in CA Supplement.

Option:

Light Emitting Diode (LED) units may be used in the border of a STOP or warning sign, except for Changeable Message Signs, to improve the conspicuity of signs.

**Standard:**

**If used, the LEDs shall be red for STOP signs and yellow for warning signs. All LED units shall flash simultaneously at a rate of more than 50 and less than 60 times per minute. The uniformity of the sign design shall be maintained without any decrease in visibility, legibility, or driver comprehension during either daytime or nighttime conditions.**



**04-4 MUTCD 2003 Revision No.1 (Pharmacy Signing)**

Caltrans pointed out that MUTCD 2003 Revision No. 1 language has been included in the agenda packet. The Pharmacy signing will be included in the federal manual effective July 21, 2004. The States have two years to adopt the policy. The pharmacy-signing requirement was included in federal legislation. The sign shall only be used to indicate the availability of a pharmacy that is open, with a State-licensed pharmacist on duty, 24 hours per day, seven days per week and it is located within 3 miles of an interchange on the Federal-aid system.

The Committee recommended not adopting the MUTCD Revision No. 1, Pharmacy signing in California.

**04-6 Proposed School Bus Sign, “Do not Pass Stopped School Bus Flashing Red Lights” Increased Fines Apply CVC 22454.5**

The county of Ventura requests approval to conduct an experiment with “Do Not Pass Stopped School Bus Flashing Red Lights” signs along a six-mile stretch of Santa Rosa Street in an unincorporated area. The residents requested installation of signs because a number of motorists do not stop when school busses flash red lights. The signs are part of an effort to educate drivers to comply with provisions of California Vehicle Code (CVC) 22454. The County will collect before data to identify violations and after data to see if the signs had a positive impact on drivers.

The Committee suggested that the County of Ventura first try other avenues such as education and enforcement. If the problem still exists, then come back to the Committee with justification for the experiment.

**04-7 Yellow Change Intervals Timing for the Signals**

The issue of yellow change interval timing (YCIT) has been around for years. Municipalities in California have traditionally used the Caltrans Traffic Manual for the yellow signal timing. Now practitioners use table 4D-102 of the California Supplement to the MUTCD 2003 (which recently replaced the Traffic Manual) which recommends the minimum YCIT be based on the “approach speed” of vehicles. However, the MUTCD 2003 and the California Supplement do not offer a clear definition of “approach speed”, and these documents are silent on whether this minimum timing should also apply to protected left-turn phases.

There was no controversy before the placement of “red light enforcement cameras” (RLEC). The RLECs are used to discourage motorists from red light violations, however, if the YCIT is not properly set, there will be a tremendous increase in violators. The RLEC violation has been challenged and the courts have thrown out violations because the approach speed is not defined and the minimum YCIT is based on the approach speed. The RLECs are very sensitive and motorists will get citations if the proper YCIT is not allocated for the signals. Therefore, it is necessary to define approach speed because this speed will be used to determine the minimum YCIT.

The Committee recommended that in applying Table 4D-102 for the calculation of the minimum YCIT, the “approach speed” is defined as the posted speed limit, or in the absence of the posted speed limit, a prima facie speed shall be used. In addition, include the equation in the California Supplement for the calculation of the minimum “YCIT”.

The Committee further recommended that the minimum yellow change interval time for any exclusive turning phases at a signalized intersection shall be 3.0 seconds (based on the 25-mph speed limit). Based

on appropriate judgement, traffic conditions and geometry of the intersection, this value may be increased.

#### **04-8 Railroad Preemption Signals**

The agenda item 04-8 was to revise Sections 8B.06, 10C.09 and Figures 8B-3, 10C-2 of the MUTCD 2003 and include in the California Supplement by deleting stationary signs and replacing them with activated blank-out signs. The proposed language would allow the use of symbol signs instead of the word message signs. California believes that symbol messages are more effective with LED technology. Figure 8B-3 and 10C-2 will be revised by deleting word message signs R3-1a and R3-2a, and replaced with activated blank-out “No Left-Turn”, “No Right-Turn” symbol signs and with the “Do Not Enter” word message sign. This issue was also discussed during the workshops held during the MUTCD adoption process. Finally, when the California Supplement was adopted these comments were not incorporated.

The Committee recommended adopt revised Sections 8B.06, 10C.09 and Figures 8B-3, 10C-2 of the MUTCD 2003 and to include in the California Supplement as amended and to ask Caltrans to develop policies and specifications for blank-out signs.

#### **04-9 Request to Experiment with “Watch The Road” Sign**

The City of Los Angeles requested experiment with “ Watch The Road” roadway signs as part of Los Angeles County’s Watch The Road Education and Awareness campaign. This program will test the effectiveness of safety slogan signs as part of a larger traffic safety campaign. The Watch the Road campaign began in May 2004 and will run until at least December 2005. A campaign message will be placed via television, radio, billboards, newspapers, magazines, roadway signage, bus stops, exterior and interior bus stops. The City will come back to the committee and share the success/failure of the sign. The sign would be used along with other public education campaigns. The city will collect data, if the sign reached the public, as to how the public has changed their behavior. The time period for the proposed experimentation with watch the road signs will follow the schedule of the watch the road campaign from the approval of this request to experiment until the estimated completion of the education and awareness program in May 2006, a period of approximately 18 months.

The Committee authorized the experimentation with the “Watch The Road” sign as requested by the City of Los Angeles.

#### **04-10 Slow for the Cone Zone Sign**

Caltrans is preparing to conduct pilot testing with the slow for the zone campaign, which provides advance warning to motorists and to improve safety in the work zone. A broad usage of effective signs can provide benefits to the traveling public as well as enhance work zone safety. Caltrans plans to carryout experiments on four construction projects: two on Interstate Highway I-80 near Auburn and other two are on I-15 and I-215 near San Bernardino. The experimentation team expects to collect data initially in the period of January-June of 2005. If there is a need for further studies, the team will extend the scope of the study to other locations afterwards. The experimentation team will work with Caltrans to determine the appropriate locations and duration for the work.

The Committee approve the experiment with “Slow For The Cone Zone” signs as requested by Caltrans.

**04-11 Bicycle May Use Full Lane**

The City requested to remove their experiment request from the agenda.

**04-12 Requests for experimentation with "Flashing Yellow Arrows"**

The Cities of Fullerton and Pasadena submitted an application for an experiment request with FYA during protected permissive left-turn (PPLT) phase at three intersections in each city. The City of Fullerton has received approval from FHWA to implement the FYA operation at three intersections.

The Committee authorize the experiment with "Flashing Yellow Arrow" as requested by the City of Pasadena and Fullerton.

**04-13 Older California Traffic Safety Task Force proposal to Amend MUTCD Sections 2B.45, 2C.50 and 4E.10****Section 2B.45 Traffic Signal Signs (R10-1 through R10-21)**

The Committee recommended to adopt the proposed language with the deletion of "or left" and allowing the option to use either "no right turn" symbol sign or R10-11 verbal message sign.

The existing MUTCD 2003 California Supplement Section 2B.45 "Option" on page 2B-39 is deleted and replaced as follows:

Option:

~~A supplemental sign, to the NO TURN ON RED (R10-11a) sign, may be used on the near right or left at intersections that are extremely wide or skewed.~~

*Guidance:*

*A symbolic NO TURN ON RED (R10-11) sign (see Figure 2B-19), No Right Turn on Red (CA Code R13A) sign or No Left Turn on Red (CA Code R13B) sign (see Figure 2B-101) should be used on the near right of skewed intersections where the adjacent approach leg to the left intersects the driver's approach leg at an angle of less than 75 degrees.*

*Option:*

*A symbolic NO TURN ON RED (R10-11) sign (see Figure 2B-19), No Right Turn on Red (CA Code R13A) sign or No Left Turn on Red (CA Code R13B) sign (see Figure 2B-101) may be used on the near right of extremely wide intersections*

**Section 2C.50 CROSS TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP Plaque (W4-4p)**

The Committee recommended to adopt the proposed language, however the "may" condition will be changed to a "should" condition.

The following is added to MUTCD 2003 California Supplement in Section 2C.50:

**Guidance:**

The CROSS TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP (W4-4p) plaque (see Figure 2C-8) should be used in combination with a STOP sign at two-way stop-controlled intersections when a conversion from four-way stop to two-way stop operations is implemented.

**04-14 Proposed California Supplement Text for Non-Compliant Traffic Control Devices on Existing Highways.**

Caltrans and the Committee agreed that there is a need to provide guidance to local agencies and practitioners about implementation of target compliance dates. The proposed language will be included in the California Supplement. The MUTCD has compliance dates which varies from 2 to 15 years. Caltrans has determined that the most of the devices in the field will stay in place during their useful life and even if there is inventory stocked, they could be used. Any new installation or replacement should be consistent with new standards. Some of the devices were determined that they must be replaced or removed from the field due to safety reasons. Those devices have been included in to the attached table with target dates to remove or replace with approved devices by specific dates.

The Committee recommended adopting the proposal on target compliance dates as included in the agenda packet. The proposed language will be posted with a cover letter.

To be added to Introduction part of the CA Supplement): Target Compliance Dates {for non-compliant Traffic Control Devices (TCD) on existing highways}.

**Standard:**

**Unless allowed per the Option below, in cases involving new highway or bikeway construction or reconstruction, the traffic control devices installed (temporary or permanent) shall be in conformance with the MUTCD 2003 and the California Supplement to the MUTCD 2003 before that highway is opened or re-opened to the public for unrestricted travel pursuant to the California Vehicle Code 21401.**

**Option:**

In cases involving new highway or bikeway construction or reconstruction, the traffic control devices installed (temporary or permanent) may be in accordance with pre May 20, 2004 traffic control device standards per Caltrans Traffic Manual, if in the judgement of the engineer, incorporating the MUTCD 2003 and the California Supplement standards would impose a significant delay or a significant increase in costs for the project.

**Support:**

Reconstruction, as used in the Standard and Option topics above, for the purpose of a traffic control device would mean if a particular device is modified in any form or shape or is relocated. If a reconstruction project does not modify or relocate a traffic control device, although encouraged, there would be no obligation to upgrade the traffic control device per MUTCD 2003 and the California Supplement standards.

**Standard:**

**Unless allowed per the option below, non-compliant traffic control devices on existing highways and bikeways shall be brought into compliance with the MUTCD 2003 and the California Supplement**

**as part of the systematic upgrading of substandard traffic control devices (and installation of new required traffic control devices) required pursuant to the California Vehicle Code 21401.**

Option:

All traffic control devices on existing highways and bikeways that have become non-compliant per MUTCD 2003 and the California Supplement adopted standards may remain in service through the end of their useful service life, unless identified specifically with a target compliance date per the list that follows.

To limit financial impact on agencies and for fiscal responsibility reasons, existing inventory of non-compliant traffic control devices may continue to be used until these inventories are depleted.

**Standard:**

**The target compliance dates listed in the Introduction part of the MUTCD are deleted and shall not apply in California.**

The following traffic control devices on existing highways that are non-compliant per the MUTCD 2003 and the California Supplement have been singled out for specific target compliance dates by the California Traffic Control Devices Committee and California Department of Transportation. The target compliance dates for these devices shall be as follows:

CA Code	Title/Description	Comment	Target Date
R16B	NO RIGHT TURN word message sign	Use MUTCD R3-1 No Right Turn symbol sign	<b>January 1, 2010</b>
R17B	NO LEFT TURN word message sign	Use MUTCD R3-2 No Left Turn symbol sign	<b>January 1, 2010</b>
R19	NO LEFT OR U TURN word message sign	Use MUTCD R3-18 No Left or U Turn symbol sign	<b>January 1, 2010</b>
R34A	No U TURN word message sign	Use MUTCD R3-4 No U Turn symbol sign	<b>January 1, 2010</b>
SR2-M	SPEED LIMIT 35 mph 56 km/h sign	1976 Metric sign never implemented	<b>January 1, 2007</b>
SR3-M	END 35 mph 56 km/h SPEED LIMIT sign	1976 Metric sign never implemented	<b>January 1, 2007</b>
SR24-1	STOP ON RED SIGNAL word message sign	Use MUTCD R10-6 STOP HERE ON RED with arrow sign	<b>January 1, 2010</b>
SR31	SCHOOL STOP CROSSING round shape Paddle	Use CA Code C28A octagon shape Paddle	<b>January 1, 2010</b>
SR36	CLOSED Red on White octagon shape sign	Use MUTCD R11-2 ROAD CLOSED sign	<b>January 1, 2010</b>
W54	Pedestrian Crossing Symbol with crosswalk lines	Use MUTCD W11-2 Pedestrian Crossing symbol without crosswalk lines & W16-7P diagonal downward pointing arrow plaque	<b>January 1, 2011</b>

W66	School Crossing Symbol with crosswalk lines	Use MUTCD S1-1 School Crossing symbol without crosswalk lines & W16-7P diagonal downward pointing arrow plaque	<b>January 1, 2011</b>
W66A	SCHOOL XING word message sign	Use MUTCD S1-1 School Crossing symbol without crosswalk lines & W16-7P diagonal downward pointing arrow plaque	<b>January 1, 2011</b>
SW1-1	TRAFFIC FROM RIGHT(LEFT) DOES NOT STOP with arrow sign	Use MUTCD W4-4P CROSS TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP plaque without the arrow	<b>January 1, 2007</b>
SW6-M	40 mph - 64 km/h sign	1976 Metric sign never implemented	<b>January 1, 2007</b>
SW18-2.1	VERTICAL CLEARANCE ____ FT. ____ IN.	Use MUTCD W12-2 Low Clearance sign or W12-2P rectangular plaque	<b>January 1, 2010</b>
SW25	School Symbol - SCHOOL XING with crosswalk lines	Use MUTCD S1-1 School Crossing symbol without crosswalk lines & W16-7P diagonal downward pointing arrow plaque	<b>January 1, 2011</b>
SW27	Skewed RR Crossing symbol with Motorcycle symbol sign	Use MUTCD W10-12 Skewed Crossing symbol sign	<b>January 1, 2015</b>
SW27-1	Skewed RR Crossing symbol with Motorcycle & Bike symbol sign	Use MUTCD W10-12 Skewed Crossing symbol sign	<b>January 1, 2015</b>
SW28	STEEL DECK with Motorcycle symbol sign	Use modified CA Code SW28 STEEL BRIDGE DECK word message sign	<b>January 1, 2015</b>
SW72-M	EXIT 30 mph 48 km/h sign	1976 Metric sign never implemented	<b>January 1, 2007</b>

**SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS 2002**

- 2 items carried over from 1999
- 1 item carried over from 2000
- 2 item carried over from 2001
- 27 items considered in 2004
- 22 items introduced in 2004
- 17 item completed in 2004
- 4 item approved for experimentation
- 6 items not completed in 2004

**ITEMS CARRIED INTO FUTURE YEAR**

- 04-5 Roundabout signs & Pavement Markings Guidance Proposal
- 04-6 Proposed School Bus Sign, "Do not Pass Stopped School Bus Flashing Red Lights" Increased Fines Apply CVC 22454.5
- 04-11 Bicycle May Use full Lane
- 04-15 Older California Traffic Safety Task Force Proposal to Amend MUTCD Sections 2B.33, 2B.34, 2B.35, 2B.37, 2B.38 4D.10 and 4E.10
- 04-E Timetable for Combining the MUTCD 2003 and CA Supplement to a single document
- 04-G Overhead Pedestrian/School Crosswalk Signing wit Yellow Flashing Beacons

**ITEMS APPROVED FOR EXPERIMENTATION**

- 99-12 Speed Striping for Smart Crosswalks  
(Experiment Agency-Caltrans D7)
- 99-13 Illuminated Pavement Markers on  
Median Barriers (Experiment Agency-Caltrans D7)
- 00-5 Use of LED Pavement Markers as a Left Turn Guidance Device (Experiment Agency-City of  
Stockton and Caltrans D10)
- 01-4 Tactile Pedestrian Indicator with Audible Information  
(Experiment Agency-The City of Santa Cruz)
- 01-9 IN-ROADWAY WARNING LIGHTS AT R/R CROSSINGS  
(Experiment Agency-California Public Utilities Commission)
- 02-15 Radar Guided Dynamic Curve Warning System  
(Experimentation Agency-Caltrans D5)
- 03-1 Speed Feedback (Radar Speed) Sign  
(Experimentation Agency – City of Whittier)
- 03-4 Radar Speed Sign  
(Experiment Agency – City of Vacaville)
- 03-5 Radar Speed Sign  
(Experiment Agency – City of San Mateo)
- 03-6 Radar Speed Sign  
(Experiment Agency – City of San Jose)
- 03-13 Variable Speed Limit Sign  
(Experiment Request by the City of Campbell)
- 03-14 Numbering of Signalized Intersections  
(Experiment Request by the CVAG)
- 03-15 Radar Speed Sign  
(Experiment Request by the City of Fremont)
- 04-9 Request to Experiment with “Watch The Road” Sign  
(Experiment Agency – Los Angeles DOT)
- 04-10 Slow for the Cone Zone Sign  
(Experiment Agency – Caltrans)
- 04-12 Requests for experimentation with "Flashing Yellow Arrows"  
(Experiment Agency – City of Fullerton and Pasadena)



**STATUS OF CALTRANS ACTION ON PAST ITEMS**

01-1 U-TURN SIGNAL HEADS INDICATOR

Caltrans will develop appropriate standards to ensure visibility and make the U-turn signal head indicator an official traffic control device by inclusion in the Caltrans Traffic manual.

00-4 USE OF RAISED PAVEMENT MARKERS IN TRANSVERSE PATTERN

Caltrans will take appropriate action on the recommendation made by the Committee.

02-3 RIGHT EDGELINE

Caltrans will take appropriate action on the recommendation made by the Committee

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Captain Lenley Duncan will be the voting member representing the California Highway Patrol (CHP) replacing Captain Bridgett Lott. Also, Lieutenant Mark Mulgrew replaced John Olejnik as the CHP

**CTCDC Agenda, Minutes, Annual Reports, and other information is available on the Internet at "<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/newtech/>" under the Office of Signs and Delineation webpage.**

Additional information regarding the minutes of the CTCDC meetings held during 2004 may be obtained upon request from the Secretary or any member of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee.

**SIGN SPECIFICATIONS**

As provided in California Vehicle Code Sections 21400 and 21401, a list of the current sign specifications used on streets and highways in California is available on the following website:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/signdel/specs.htm>

Respectfully submitted by Devinder Singh, Secretary, CTCDC